

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present Application. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended herein. Care has been exercised not to introduce new matter. Claims 56-70 have been added new. Claims 1-2, 7, 53, and 56-70 are pending and are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-2 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitchin, U.S. Patent No. 7,130,904 in view of Meier, U.S. Patent No. 6,847,620.

Regarding claim 1, Kitchin does not teach “establishing a security association with said end station within said BSS wherein the security association includes at least two keys, one key for encryption and another key for computing an authentication code.” Kitchin does not teach that a security association is established between an end station and the access point within the BSS. Therefore, it would not have been obvious to combine Kitchin with Meier. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be removed.

For at least the above reasons, claim 2 depends from claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 2 be removed.

Regarding claim 7, Kitchin does not teach “establishing a security association with each of said end stations within said BSS wherein the security association includes at least two keys, one key for encryption and another key for computing an authentication code.” Kitchin does not teach that a security association is established between an end station and the access point within the BSS. However, Kitchin discloses a security policy but this security policy does not involve implementing two keys, one for encryption and the other for computing

an authentication code. Therefore, it would not have been obvious to combine Kitchin with Meier. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 7 be removed.

Further, regarding claims 1 and 7, Kitchin does not teach "receiving at least one parameter defining said BSS." The Office Action states that this elements is interpreted as associating a BSS with a class of subscribers or clients. The Office Action also interprets the element as the BSSID or ESSID. Applicant respectfully points out that the Office must comply with MPEP 2143.03 by giving patentable weight to all elements in a claim. As such, no language can be found in Kitchin where the wireless access point receives a parameter that defines the BSS. Clearly, Kitchin discloses after the fact that beacon signals are sent out from the wireless access point whereby each beacon signal may include a BSSID or ESSID. However, Kitchin never discloses a parameter sent to the wireless access point that defines the BSS. Therefore, it would not have been obvious to combine Kitchin with Meier. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1 and 7 be removed.

Claim 53 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitchin, U.S. Patent No. 7,130,904 in view of Meier, U.S. Patent No. 6,847,620 and further in view of Kimura, U.S. Publication No. 2001/0048744.

For at least the above reasons, claim 53 depends from claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 53 be removed.

Claims 56-70 were added new. Applicant respectfully point out that claims 56-70 are not taught by Kitchin, Meier, or Kimura, either singly or in combination.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 1-2, 7, 53, and 56-70 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of the claims. If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned – 816-474-6550 or lsearcy@shb.com (such communication via email is herein expressly granted) – to resolve the same.

The fee for a one-month extension of time is submitted herewith. The present amendment is being filed concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination under 37 CFR 1.114. The required fee of \$810 is enclosed. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2112, referencing Attorney Docket Number 324413.06/MFCP.141333.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard Searcy, II//

Leonard Searcy, II
Reg. No. 53,574

LS/bp
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613
816-474-6550